

April 5, 2015 (#1497)  
"Cutting Through the Matrix" with Alan Watt  
(Blurb, i.e. Educational Talk)

**"Lies and Deception Always in Season,  
A Good Excuse for the Masses, Then a Secret, Real  
Reason"**

© Alan Watt April 5, 2015

Title & Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - April 5, 2015 (Exempting Music  
and Literary Quotes)

---

[cuttingthroughthematrix.com](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.com)

alternate sites:

[cuttingthroughthematrix.net](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.net) , [.us](http://.us) , [.ca](http://.ca)

[alanwattcuttingthroughthematrix.ca](http://alanwattcuttingthroughthematrix.ca)

European site includes all audios & downloadable TRANSCRIPTS in European  
languages for print up:

[alanwattsentientsentinel.eu](http://alanwattsentientsentinel.eu)

---

mirror site:

[cuttingthrough.jenknness.com](http://cuttingthrough.jenknness.com)

---

**Information for purchasing Alan's books, CDs, DVDs and  
DONATIONS:**

**Canada and America:** PayPal, Cash, personal checks &  
for the US, **INTERNATIONAL** postal money orders / for Canada, INTERNAL postal  
money orders

(America: Postal Money orders - Stress the **INTERNATIONAL** pink one, not the green  
internal one.)

**Outside the Americas:** PayPal, Cash, Western Union and Money Gram  
(Money Gram is cheaper; even cheaper is a Money Gram check - in Canadian dollars:  
mail via the postal services worldwide.)

**PayPal Orders: USE THE [DONATE](#) BUTTON ON THE WEBSITE - AND -**  
Send a separate email along with the donation (list your order, name and address)

**Click the link below for your location (ordering info):**

[USA](#)

[Canada](#)

[Europe/Scandinavian](#)

[All Other Countries](#)

---

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix on April 5, 2015. Now, last week I mentioned that if you think life is becoming just too overwhelming with the daily feed of what's given to you as news, and all the horrors of what *could* be happening or what *might* happen, all the catastrophes that *could* happen and so on, switch off for a while and don't worry about it. Because if you were to go through all the different agencies that give you all the fear factors you'll find it's been happening your whole darn life, and to your parents as well. Because that's what control is, is by keeping you in fear. And as I have mentioned so many times, someone who is abused will turn to the abuser for protection to quell all their fears when it's just too overwhelming.

So understand, you're not the first generation to go through all of this. Those who think they've woken up really haven't, that's for the majority of those. They're following certain agencies that give them all their information and they're given various spins and so on, but they're never given all the facts involved and the agencies involved behind it all and the techniques as to how it works so well.

From ancient times to the present we always looked towards the strong man, who is generally the psychopath, to protect us, you see. Now we have agencies and governments full of them, because that's who gets to the top in a psychopathic system, especially when money is the key factor for controlling everything. Everyone is dependent upon it, you're given no choice whatsoever. And psychopaths go to where the power is, and when power comes through money, that's where they head for, you see. They claw their way up. They're vicious. There also clever, if they come from the right, they always say, social classes and so on, or strata, social strata. But what they really mean is a class system of course. Because they're protected more if they are in the upper middle-class families or above. Because anything they do in their teenage years which are psychopathic, is covered over as simply juvenile or teenage, you know, energy, super energy, that kind of thing, so they get off with it. And since daddy and mommy generally can pull strings to get them off, then that's what happens, they're shielded from the problems of the lower-class psychopaths.

So remember, you get them in all strata. If you're born into a higher, well off system and parents and so on, you'll find that, you'll learn the cultural norms, even if you don't understand them because you don't actually feel the emotions of them, but you know it works on everyone else, and you become a better psychopath, you see. You're put into the better schools where you can't fail either; that's a fact as well, folks, it happens in all, again, social strata of universities. You can't fail depending on daddy and mommy and all the rest of it, and who knows the dean, and who gives the grants to the universities.

So, it's a psychopathic system that runs us and it really has been for an awful, awful long time. Once we left the old tribal system, and introduced money at the same time, the head chief could then keep his family line going, and employ as many mercenaries as he wants, even under, *oh, it's really a government army*, it doesn't matter what they call it, and quell any people who tried to throw them over and put him out of the tribe. And it's been that way ever since.

With the advent of all the sciences, and all your tax money that's actually going into all the studies, that are done on you, [Alan chuckles.] so they can understand your behavior better and manipulate it all, it's been on the go for such a long time, the scientific indoctrination we get and scientific observation. Now it's complete, really, with the Internet, cell phones and all the rest of it. So everyone is profiled and they enable themselves to be profiled by thinking that somehow they're so smart that nothing will ever be used against them down the road. And nothing is further from the truth.

Therefore, understand what's happening. If you understand what's happening and realize that you're not the first generation to understand what's happening, then it makes it much easier. Other folk in previous generations, there was always a few who understood from childhood, who...many simply rebel. They don't understand why it's all wrong. They rebel. They sometimes turn anger inwards, they drink

themselves to death or drug themselves to death. If they had information provided when they were young they would understand why things are happening, why the system is the way it is, why the culture is the way it is too.

Because every culture is planned for every generation. It's planned culture. There's no separate culture industry and separate governments and so on. Everyone is a product to an extent of the culture industry, which is essential for psychopaths at the top to control societies. It's more evident in the US where, with incredible indoctrination to the flags and symbols and so on, they can convince the public of anything and look at all the Pentagon sponsored movies that are out there on war and all the rest of it. It's just quite fascinating to see how well it works.

Remember, that worked on ancient Rome too with the culture. If you were a man you had to join the Legion and he had to go off and fight the wars. And he had little trade-offs in those days because you could steal and have some booty as they called it, plunder, that you could keep for yourself now and then. But essentially that is what a man was supposed to be, always fighting expansionist wars for your masters. And the Roman system went in and expanded its empire, introduced the money system to the countries that didn't have it, then taxed it from them, and made sure they all had to use the monetary system, they couldn't just barter anymore and be self-sufficient. That's the first thing that must go is self-sufficiency. Therefore, you have to earn money to pay the taxes or else, and in the Roman days they would just simply cut your throat. Today it's more sophisticated of course but it's the same technique. Because the Roman system itself eventually went under because eventually with all the massive taxes from all their Empire flooding in to keep a tiny elite in the middle of Rome living in prosperity, incredible prosperity, they still ran out of taxes. It's always the same story. Because even the Roman elite, you know, borrowed from private bankers, and they have many names of who they were and where they came from and often it wasn't Rome itself.

So the system of money sponsoring psychopathic ambitions is very, very, very old. Because they go together. One goes with the other, always. It's never, ever separate. And right to the present day it's the same thing. Britain when under too because it's spent so many centuries borrowing money from private moneylenders, for their wars, putting the populations down as the guarantors to pay off the debts by taxation and taxing them, and eventually it ran out of steam. It's like someone who ends up with emphysema and they can't even get a breath in or breath out properly, that's what happens in expansionist psychopathic systems. And nothing's changed. Nothing has changed regardless of who apparently is the dominant character playing the game in your nation, or your Empire, or the opponent's Empire, it's all the same system.

Now, back in the 90s I came out and said that people should stop beating themselves on the head with anxiety and anger and frustration, not knowing why this goes on and on and on. And I said, I didn't come out to be a cheerleader for the masses. Most of the people in the mass will go along with any system they are given. They're the followers of the psychopathic system. In fact, they're happy to try and emulate, however futilely, the ones at the top, regardless of, again, their social strata or class that they happen to belong to. Because you want to be a winner, that's always put out, you're a winner, you're awfully successful, it's better

than being a loser, and you despise those down beneath you. That's always the psychopathic system. You'll see it in tyrannies of even the 20th century where generals are always, who are psychopathic themselves, clustered around the top psychopath. And the psychopath can only admire a more cunning and vicious psychopath, they literally grovel to them. And they want that position too but they never try and get it and grab it themselves, but they will obediently serve the master, and they will beat the rank beneath them all the way down. That's how it works in a psychopathic system.

When they don't use overt tyranny they use the capitalist system, which is all the same thing by the way, fascist/capitalist/communist. It's all the same honchos that get to the top. All based on materialism. And in the capitalist system it's Empire restructuring under the guise of peacekeeping. It's beautiful isn't it, how it can be disguised by the use of terminology. They learned that a long time ago too, how you could literally alter terminology, that's what law is all about, altering the meaning of terminology to make something more acceptable to the populace. And it works awfully, awfully well. We don't send soldiers anywhere, we send *peacekeepers* to go off and expand the empires. Again, there's always a *good* reason they give you, you see, but it's never the *real* reason. There's always a good reason for the people, and a real reason. And the real reason of course is expansionist capitalism where people who run your countries, the top corporate groups, bankers, corporations and everything else, that are all tied together by the way at the top, often intermarried, they expand all their enterprises under the guise of, going over there to preserve peace, in one country or another. And they run the media therefore they can always tell you the propaganda at home is to, well here's the reason were going over there, they're fighting each other, it's to stop them, or, to bring civilization to them, etc. etc. They have used every excuse under the sun. Today it's more sophisticated of course because most folk do believe what authorities tell them. And that's the key, too, in behavioral sciences, and the nudge programs, and the neuroscientist involved in all these things, masses of them today, massive profession, well-paid of course because they work for governments and so on to make sure that they train an update the population, almost instantaneously, when the new agenda comes forth.

You see, you're taught, here's the politically correct way, the authoritarian way to say something to them. They will obey the authoritarian voice, the familiar face on television giving them the news, and they will believe it, you see, they won't question it. That's what most people go by. That's always been that way. That's why they keep anchors, well-known anchor people on television, and actually make them star profiles by lots of propaganda and interviews and so on, to make them into what you think in your mind is a star, and a kind of daddy figure who would never lie to you. And they keep them until they're tottering off their seats because they're so darned old, because you have grown up with them and that's awfully important, you see.

We follow what's called the stars. It's an old occultic term too, following the stars. You're taught to follow the stars, so they *create* stars. Creating a star could take anybody, give them a little bit of acting lessons, deportment and so on, and train them to the authoritarian way that they put things over, they're confident, assertive and so on, and then give them a massive buildup in the press, get lots of publicity everywhere, until in your mind they become a star. It's not different from creating an actor for entertainment, or indeed, the new musician or artiste in

music or whatever it happens to be, and the heartthrob, the male heartthrob for the females, and the extroverted young slut, that is the in-thing today, for the females. It's all controlled, and discussed at the top, not just by the culture industry because guys who also own governments own them both you see, and they must approve or disapprove, yeah, this is the way to go. And the myriads of, again, behavioral scientists, psychologists, neuroscientists, all involved in keeping the system going, and directing the future at all times.

People follow the stars, they emulate the stars, regardless of, again, their social strata or class. And they emulate the behaviors, which they put across as being, oh, you know, exhibitionist or the in-thing, the trendy, popular, the popular... don't you want to be the popular person at school, college and so on. The popular ...they tell you what it's supposed to be. And unfortunately the mass of people, the bulk of them, will emulate that, and be totally blackmailable throughout their whole lives, forever now with the social media. That's part of the intention of it of course too.

So there's always a war going on and it's not the ones that are across the seas that bother you. It's the ones internally because it's always upon *you*, to do with your behavioral updates, your conditioning, the monitoring of you, whether you know it or not, or even care or not, and to make sure that *you're* the product. See, *you are the product*. Not the iPhone, not the Internet, *YOU* are the product that all these things enable you to be, and you are designed that way. Some folk, the few, as I say, who understand very early on when they're young, depending on their temperament as well, they can understand it and not cave in and collapse under the fear of it all. But they understand it. If you understand things, as I say, it should not cripple you. You shouldn't let anything cripple you mentally. Because remember too, since it's a war, they want the casualties. The casualties they want are the ones who could be people who are thinkers, and speakers, of facts down the road. They don't want that. They'd rather those ones when they're young literally whack their brain on drugs and booze and all the rest of it. Then they are out of the picture, they're no problem, they're disabled. So for those who are young, and I said back in the 90s, I'm only looking for the ones, the few, who are turning in on themselves rather than looking, getting the facts, understanding the facts, so they don't punish themselves or destroy themselves in the process. That's more important.

You can stop the general TV population, the ones who are always viewing and soaking everything up that's put out for them, which they think is entertainment, they think they are in charge of it. They think they are in charge of their own minds. But that's not the purpose of entertainment. It's a very... [Alan chuckles.] it's completely weaponized. Completely. It doesn't matter what the story line is, the hook to get you in to watch the rest of it, it's all the messages you get *along the way* that's so important. Understand why it works, how it works, you're not the first generation it's worked on, and you won't punish yourself the same way. You become much, much stronger, more self-confident and self-assured. A few of them of course, the psychopathic ones will catch on quickly, the streetwise ones, and they will want to get up there themselves, that happens too, you see.

So I don't speak to the... I speak to the ones who are trying to punish themselves because everything is just, as they see it, wrong. They are suffering from the fallout of the destruction of the family unit, that was all intentional. What is a family today? It's portrayed through Hollywood in certain movies, especially the

new ones, more and more so they show you that they're all dysfunctional. No one is talking to anybody. The guy is a wimp. The mother is going off and having affairs. And everybody's chatting on the Internet to look for affairs. And their children are all putting out the little porn things across the net as well. That's all intentional. Everybody must be an open book and if you're not an open book they want to destroy you by other methods, preferably having you destroy yourself. Don't do that.

Keep the information in your mind and don't be hysterical about it. Be calm about it. It's your life - and an old saying too which goes through a lot of occultic themes and all the rest of it, it doesn't matter where it came from, but the fact is, it's true. You are only in charge of yourself. The only person you can be certain of influencing and in control of, as much as possible in this system, is yourself. Don't think it's a personal challenge that your ego must take on everybody else's ego and defeat them until they are a clone of you. That's called tyranny. That's how tyrants acts and work, you see. And you destroy yourself in the process, because you've got to accept the fact that it's not your job to make, you can't make people change. You have enough work to do on yourself, believe you me. And if you meet people along the way who are asking questions, then you answer them as carefully, and I mean as carefully as possible. Not like some mad nutter that lives 24 hours a day listening to various shows that terrify you, terrify you, terrify you, it sounds like a raving nutcase with pressure of speech, the way they deliver it and so on, and hysteria. That's not how you put things across. To teach anyone you must be patient, considerate, and careful, and don't give them a whole library of information, which seems disjointed and unrelated the way it's put across, deliberately I believe, by many of the things they listen to. You've got to go through things in a careful order because you're showing someone. It's like any kind of teaching, it's the same way, you must stay on the same topic for a while, the same particular topic for a while. And you'll be surprised to find that the person, when they hear and start to understand that topic will start thinking on other things for themselves for the first time.

I'm going to touch on some stories now which are important, to show you the techniques as well. There's no point just throwing out stories. You've got to understand how it's done, why it's done, and the techniques used behind them all, and their goals and so on. There's nothing in mainstream that isn't carefully selected, worked over, in order to put it across to you, to make sure that you get what the authority says is the right understanding, the authorized understanding of the topic.

And this one is, again, to do with the bill C-51, it's called in Canada, which is much the same as the British bill. We're having the same bills across the Five Eyes countries and so on, the ones that are all part of, and have been since at least World War II, the Empire system of pushing for global empire and domination, etc. to keep the peace, and so that...again too, they even teach in the wars schools the British Empire system, which it is still an empire by the way and it's not British. But regardless, it does matter. This whole idea of Empire, they said that, again, they get taught in officers' training that war can only be eradicated when there are no more nations, nations must be eradicated, and have global government. Now they call it governance, because many agencies are involved in governance, private ones too, to make sure that there will be no, that we'll have eternal peace, you won't have this friction, you see. This is the excuse and con of it all. And it's

nothing to do with the truth because the truth is, when psychopaths rule at the top anyway they must always turn, then, on those internally. You're seeing a bit of that with different bills that get passed through all, from Britain and different countries and so on. It's, again, to take away freedoms from people, to give the rulers the supposed open right of spying on everyone, to keep you all safe. You see, that's how it's done.

Now, here's one here and it's called:

**Diane Ablonczy** (*Alan: ...in Canada.*) **Uses Air Quotes** (*A: That's for quotation marks, they put their fingers up and so on.*) **While Discussing**  
**'Rule Of Law,' Bill C-51**

[huffingtonpost.ca](http://huffingtonpost.ca) / Jesse Ferreras / 04/02/2015

*(A: It's coming to Canada, you see. I think it's pretty well a done deal.)*

Diane Ablonczy has an interesting way of talking about the "rule of law" and "fundamental justice."

The Conservative MP was taking part in a review of Bill C-51, her party's controversial anti-terror legislation, in a meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security on Tuesday.

She addressed an amendment to the bill, proposed by the Green party, (*A: You know, they're all... I don't believe in any of the parties to be honest with you.*) that took inspiration from recommendations by the Canadian Bar Association (CBA). (*A: And I'm sure the Canadian Bar Association is part of the British Bar Association and all the other ones and so on.*)

Here are some of the remarks:

"... the Green Party wants to throw some other things into the mix ... Now the judge has to also consider, in addition to the Charter and the CSIS Act, they have to consider something like, 'rule of law.' They have to consider things like 'principles of fundamental justice,' whatever that is."

Ablonczy used air quotes with her fingers when she mentioned "rule of law" and "principles of fundamental justice." (*A: Because understand, going back to the days of Plato, Plato said there is no justice, but for the people's sake there must be the appearance, only the appearance of justice. A: It's never changed.*)

We can't help but wonder where we've seen that gesture before...

Ablonczy may not have been trying to be dismissive of the concepts of "rule of law" and "fundamental justice." She is a former lawyer herself. (*A: Well naturally. We're run by lawyers, armies of them.*)

But she nevertheless objected to them being used as additional barriers that judges have to bypass when authorizing the Canadian Security Intelligence

Service (CSIS) to violate Charter rights in the name of reducing security threats.

Sections 12.1(3) and 21.1 of the bill prevent Canada's spy agency from doing so unless they've obtained a warrant.

The CBA recommended that the bill be changed so that those sections conformed with the "fundamental role of Canada's judiciary in upholding the Rule of Law and Canada's constitutional guarantees."

"This aspect of the proposed Bill is at odds with the role of the courts and the judiciary system," the association wrote in a submission.

"Canada's judges are charged with upholding the Rule of Law and Canada's Constitution against unlawful state action. They should not be conscripted by the state to limit Charter rights."

But Ablonczy disagreed with the CBA, saying that such an amendment would put action "pretty much at a stalemate."

It was struck down at committee.

Now, you know, many Canadians won't even be thinking about this, this kind of thing. They don't, most folk don't reason through what's happening, or even think it affects them in any way. That's the perfectly conditioned citizen, the television viewer who believes in the mainstream professional news announcers, again, that they've grown up with and has been there for years, and it never dawns on them that they could be lied to, very cleverly too and using a lot of sophistication. It never occurs to them at all. After all, I mean, when you're born in naïveté why would you ever think that they're out to get you, in some way or another, and nasty things are happening. Why would you? Are you taught that at school? No.

And then you have this article about the same thing:

## **Elizabeth May, Greens Say Bill C-51 Still Dangerous Despite**

**Tory (A: *...conservative.*) Amendments**

[huffingtonpost.ca](http://huffingtonpost.ca) / Jim Bronskill / 03/30/2015

OTTAWA - A Conservative plan to amend the federal anti-terrorism bill hasn't squelched opposition to the sweeping security legislation.

A handful of proposed government amendments, to be presented Tuesday, haven't alleviated Green party Leader Elizabeth May's concerns about what she calls a dangerous and undemocratic bill.

May said she plans to present five dozen amendments when the House of Commons public safety committee begins examining the 62-page bill clause-by-clause.

Seven leading human rights groups, including Amnesty International Canada



and the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, issued a joint statement Monday calling on the government to withdraw the legislation.

*(A: Now, this is what was discussed back in the early 1900s, of what democracy would be legislated as, with the rulers of the Empire system of its day, the empires. That eventually it will be parties that are authorized by those who own the system. And you would also have on behalf of the public the appearance of people who would speak for you. And so you have Amnesty International Canada authorized, and by the United Nations, which the rulers of London and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, a private organization, the CFR, created. That was the whole idea. They created the IMF, the Bank for International Settlements, for the global society, the central banking system that must be put in, even one for Europe, and their members, their private members all drafted the bills for NAFTA and for the European Union. So here they have the ones for the public, supposedly, run by this authorized, again, by the same group, to speak on behalf of you, you know, the silent majority, because most of the silent majority are watching porn or something else, you see, or 50 Shades of Gray which is the next best thing. You don't vote for these groups either, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, made up of more lawyers and so on, and Amnesty International Canada, which is awfully selective in who it decries, and they have turned a blind eye many times to countries where, your countries are involved in torture abroad in different places. So they are very controlled group themselves. So you really have no one to stand up for you. You see, that's what I've been saying all along. You have to stand up for yourself. That's all you can do.)*

The NDP and Liberals have also called for changes to protect civil liberties and improve oversight of security agencies.

However, Conservative ministers appearing before a Senate committee Monday made it clear the government has no plans to create a full-fledged national security committee of parliamentarians like the ones in Britain and the United States. *(A: Well, they don't have to because they have them, quietly, you see.)*

The government bill, drafted in response to the murders of two Canadian soldiers last October, would give the Canadian Security Intelligence Service more power to thwart suspected terrorist plots — not just gather information about them.

*(A: It's not just to do with terror. It's total. It's giving themselves what they already have the right to do, to spy on everybody, and they do it all the time. We've had many, many whistleblowers over the years come out and tell you all this stuff and lots of information about it. But this is to give them the legal right to do it, which sounds better, again, for the silent majority... Oh, well, it's a legal thing, you know, it's legally authorized. It's a psychological trick.)*

It would allow CSIS to violate the Charter of Rights and Freedoms with a judge's permission, expand the sharing of federal security information *(A: To whom?)*, broaden no-fly list powers and create a new criminal offence of encouraging someone to carry out a terrorism attack.

*(A: Now, we've had instances in Britain, the States and Canada of secret agencies, your internal secret agencies attempts in the past to create radicals, put out their own spies to encourage the radicals, even give them explosives even though they are generally dummy. In other words, sting operations, they create the thing and then they come in and arrest them and they say, hey we caught a bunch. Would these young guys have even gotten together if they had not had someone trained in psychology, with an outgoing personality, very confident, and generally of their own race because you generally hire ones from these particular ethnic communities and put them into your own security agencies, to create stings. So here you have this thing... . . . create a new criminal offence of encouraging someone to carry out a terrorism attack. Well, shouldn't you arrest those who create the groups in the first place? And, of encouraging someone to carry out a terrorism attack . . . Doesn't that apply to the ones that carry out the stings? It doesn't take much to pick it apart, does it, or to use some logic here. So it's nothing to do with that, obviously, it's got something to do with what they're already doing on you, and to expand their powers, and ACT on their powers, of knowing all about you, and nothing to do with terrorism.)*

In addition, the bill would make it easier for the RCMP to obtain a peace bond to restrict the movements of suspects and extend the amount of time they can be kept in preventative detention.

*(A: That's the name now for throwing the key away and no court case comes to light. Again, the use of terminology, something that used to be thought of as a horrific thing that kings and queens did in the past across Europe where they would throw folk in the slammer forever, they didn't see a magistrate or a judge or anybody because they had no power at all. Power is the system, if it slams you inside the hole, never to see the light of day again, often, then that's what they did. Now it's called preventative detention, it doesn't sound so terrible does it? Just put you inside a dungeon with no lighting generally or maybe 4 inches of light, and the water coming through the walls and everything else. I keep saying that nothing has changed, in a psychopathic system, down through the ages, just their terminology, which is more, you know, it's more user-friendly, the terminology.)*

Sources have told The Canadian Press the government plans to introduce four changes to clarify or curtail elements of the bill, including an assurance the information-sharing powers do not apply to protesters who demonstrate outside the letter of the law. *(A: In other words, they want to make sure that their authorized protesters, the different parties I mentioned earlier, the NGOs, who are authorized, because they're always pushing for cultural changes, to make things worse, you know. So they need them, so they gotta make sure that they put something in there so that they can't be arrested and put in the slammer forever, because they are a tool.)*

But the amendments do not remedy several key concerns of opposition MPs *(A: Members of Parliament.)* and rights advocates.

"The reality is this bill will make us less safe," May told a news conference.

She denounced the legislation as vague, badly drafted and, ultimately, "dangerous garbage."

The NDP (A: *National Democratic Party.*) and Greens plan to vote against it, while the Liberals intend to support the bill despite their desire to see changes. (A: *And so on and so on it goes. They're also talking here about, it says:)*

Liberal Sen. Colin Kenny reminded MacKay that he once supported the idea of a committee of security-cleared parliamentarians, who would be entrusted with secret material, as a means of better monitoring spies.

MacKay said his thinking had evolved on the issue, particularly with regard to the danger of leaks.

(A: *Now, here's a little thing that ties in with this. You see, Britain had that all through the Cold War, of selected parliamentarians, in generally the House of Lords and I guess in other countries it will be the Senate, that supposedly were given all this data, the secret data. And it was so blatant as to what they really did, these particular individuals, during the Cold War. Because they all got the first dibs because they understand where the government was going to invest money to do with the war, the Cold War, and the missile industry and so on, that they had massive shares in and some of them even owned them. So much so that even documentaries, or even dramas that came out afterwards, they actually showed you the scams that they did. Oh, the Russians of got a better missile, we're all in danger. And this person gets first dibs information in the private secret hearings and he would be off to his company and you know, oh yeah, here's how to put it across, this will be a faster and better antimissile/missile, that will defeat that one, we'll get them to push that and lobby for that. And so on and so on. Nothing changes. Today it's all the guys who are involved in the secret things for governments, have the massive shares or they're corporate owners too of all the security equipment that spy on you and everything else. Massive money. Anyway this says:)*

"For matters of national security, I am concerned about the handling of sensitive information that could literally put a person's life at risk."

MacKay and Blaney praised the Security Intelligence Review Committee, a civilian body that reports to Parliament on CSIS's activities. (A: *And so on and so on.*)

So it's a done deal. And regardless of what they'll tell you they're simply legitimizing all the things they've been doing all along the way without telling you. But they like things themselves to be, you know, officially legal, so they simply pass a law and make it legal, you see. Remember, before, kidnapping was illegal, but now when they want to kidnap someone, whisk them off to another country and torture them, or even within your own country, it's called extraordinary rendition. Again, this kind of confusing user-friendly, marketing PR that they use, so's that the folk don't get the same terrible connotations of torture and fear and horror, you know. It works awfully well.

And then a little article too, to show you that Canada is the same as every other country, because we're all on the same bus in other words, every country is on the same bus, on the same road, with the same systems. Because it is the same system, with the same bankers lending to governments and so on, and corporate CEOs and that who are all just simply, again, members of the same big banking corporations, regardless of the corporation that they are put in charge of.

## **After 50 Years of the Canada Pension Plan We've Run Off Course**

[huffingtonpost.ca](http://huffingtonpost.ca) / 03/30/2015

*(A: Now, they've been saying this for years. They're only about 30 years behind Britain I think. Because it was never intended that all this money that was to get put in this vast, in a pool of money, by law that you must pay, for the right to work, you know, you must pay, that they're going to use, someone uses you see, and it's all private corporations now that use it, massive money of yours that's now a massive fund and they invest it, and they skim off the gold at the top and you're given the dross at the bottom. Everything has got a real reason and for you they give the good reason. Oh that's good enough for you to believe, here's the real reason. So this article goes on about:)*

Lester Pearson was a remarkable Canadian. We first came to know him as a proficient global statesman, skilled in the diplomacy of multilateralism. He assisted at the birth of the United Nations, invented the concept of peace-keeping (A: Again, terminology changes...), and won the Nobel Peace Prize. (A: Well, so did a whole bunch of people who were involved in slaughter across the planet.) In 1963, he became Prime Minister of Canada.

*(A: Now, what they're not telling you here is that Lester Pearson was also a member of the big Royal Institute of International Affairs, the Canadian branch of foreign affairs which is the Royal Institute of International Affairs, for globalism, run by top bankers and everything, who pushed communism. And Lester Pearson with some other diplomats from Canada, especially Ontario, were quite honest about their ambition. They said when they were setting up the United Nations, and they worked with Alger Hiss who became a convicted communist eventually. But they were pushing all the communists' globalist agenda. And communism has nothing to do with what you are taught it is, believe you me. Even the followers are conned silly. It was never the intention for the workers to be equal, never ever the intention. It was always for the scientific, an elite intellectually to rule the world, properly, you see, properly. And it has never changed. The techniques are still used although they don't call them communism today. But anyway Lester Pearson was quite blatant about the fact that they were creating the beginnings of the system to create global government, you see. Technically they were traitors of their day, [Alan chuckles.] when you had fought supposed massive enemies and I mean a massive war, World War II and before that World War I, to keep your nation and your culture and your way of life, which is an awful joke, that's what they push in times of war. Look at Britain now. And look at Canada, it's the same thing, we've got masses of debt and all the rest of it. So he's given all these accolades, this Lester Pearson, and this says:)*

Five years in that job, Mr. Pearson never once had a majority in Parliament (*A: And that shows you who put him in.*), but still he led one of the most productive governments in Canadian history.

This past February, we celebrated the 50th anniversary of Canada's Red Maple Leaf Flag -- one of Mr. Pearson's proudest accomplishments. Next year, we'll mark the 50th anniversary of national medicare, another Pearsonian legacy.

And this week, the legislation that originally created the Canada Pension Plan (CPP) will turn 50 years old. It passed the House of Commons on March 29, 1965, was approved in the Senate on April 1 and received Royal Assent on April 3. (*A: And that's your April fool's joke, hey, approved in the Senate on April 1st.*) The CPP and its Quebec counterpart came into effect on January 1, 1966.

*(A: Now, what they'll tell you is an excuse for all things going wrong, but not in this article. But generally what they'll tell you is, well we based all this on the prospect after World War II that gross national product would always go up and up and up and up, you see. And so there would always be lots of money, a massive taxation base with larger wages and larger taxes, to pay for the pensions, to pay those folk who are retiring and whose pensions themselves are going into a big slush fund, that was then privately funded across the world and into investments, you see, with the same idea that every country it was invested in would be on a win-win situation for ever and ever and ever, with this gross national product always going up and up and up and up, something that at no time in history has ever been true for any length or period. So this is the story here, as they applaud all this.)*

And this week, the legislation that originally created the Canada Pension Plan (CPP) will turn 50 years old. It passed the House of Commons on March 29, 1965, was approved in the Senate on April 1 and received Royal Assent on April 3. The CPP and its Quebec counterpart came into effect on January 1, 1966.

The stated purpose of the Canada Pension Plan was to ensure all working Canadians have an opportunity to retire in dignity. It builds on basic Old Age Security to achieve greater social justice linked to progress in the economy.

*(A: As you know, since that time the dollar has been devalued hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of times, so the purchasing power is nowhere near what that dollar invested 50 years ago is, and it was spent long ago by the way. The big returns come into the corporations that run the slush funds and so on, and a little bit trickles back into where it's supposed to go.)*

Established by federal-provincial agreement, the CPP is a mandatory contributory plan into which all employees and employers pay regular premiums. (*A: A mandatory contribution plan, you're not allowed to...in other words, don't you worry about it, we'll take the money off you, by law, and you better pay it, if you want to work, or you can't work. And we'll take that money and when you retire you can live in dignity. This says:)* That money is invested to generate the returns necessary to cover the plan's benefits. (*A:*

*And that was the con.)* As such, CPP contributions are essential long-term investments in portable retirement incomes for a large portion of Canadians, supporting their future living standards.

That sounds like common sense today (*A: And they go into the reasons why blah blah blah they put it through. And it says:*) . . .

The CPP was an historic accomplishment!

But by the 1990s (*A: It was before this actually.*)-- with longer life expectancies (*A: So they're blaming you for it... you see. [Alan chuckles.]*), aging demographics and escalating unfunded liabilities -- doubts had arisen about the future soundness of the Canada Pension Plan. Would it run out of money? Was the investment strategy getting adequate returns? Were the benefits supportable? Was the administration strong, efficient and independent? The plan clearly required major renovations to save it, and that would take federal-provincial consensus, which is always hard to get.

As part of a multi-pronged effort to restore fiscal integrity to the Government of Canada, then-federal Finance Minister Paul Martin Jr. decided to tackle the CPP challenge. He found a key ally in the Provincial Treasurer of Alberta, Jim Dinning. Ontario Finance Minister Ernie Eves was also helpful. Together, they built the business case, the social consensus and the national momentum to rejuvenate the CPP.

It's an interesting historical footnote that saving the plan earned strong support across Canada -- except for provincial NDP governments in British Columbia and Saskatchewan, and Stephen Harper and his Reform (now Conservative) Party.

Today, the CPP ranks as one of only a handful of successful public pension plans worldwide. Its administration is competent and cost-effective. It's a distinct fund, independently managed (*A: By whom, hey?*) according to investment policies that are free from political interference. It has a proven track-record as an international leader in the pension industry, generating world-class rates of return. (*A: Well if they get world-class... what are world-class rates of return? Are they talking about part of the world, you know, India? You know, where? It doesn't tell you. I mean, this money that you pay in, is lent out, lent out, lent out, that's what investments are. And massive returns on very high interest lending to other countries and so on and different corporations down through the years, it does generate a lot of money, it is reinvested over and over and over again, and lent out and lent out and lent out. But you who pay it in get very little at the end of it all, the cream always goes off the top.*) External actuaries have recently judged the CPP to be sound and secure for another 75 years (the maximum actuaries will go). (*A: No, that's a joke, that one.*)

Because it's been neglected for the past nine years, the CPP is labouring under one major limitation. The maximum regular benefit a contributor can receive is just over \$12,000 per year. (*A: Well, that was not bad 50 years ago, right. But were talking about the present day, \$12,000 a year.*) The average is just more than half that. (*A: \$6,000 a year.*) Those amounts are far from

sufficient to ensure retirees can maintain their (A: *Here's the purpose:*) quality of life, without other significant savings.

But the typical 35-year-old today is saving less than half of what their parents did at that age. (A: *That's because the spending power of their bucks, and, [Alan chuckles.] opportunities to work now, with globalization, all the rest of it and deindustrialization, are gone. And yet your dollar is worth darned all. How many cups of coffee could you buy 50 years ago, huh, for a dollar? How many would you get for a dollar 50 years ago? How many? You can't get any today up here in Canada.*) Three-quarters of those working in the private sector don't have access to an employer-sponsored pension plan. (A: *That's because they've done away with all their industry and everything else that used to sponsor, again, a pension plan.*) And of those who are within 10 years of retirement, fewer than one-third have \$100,000 or more set aside to sustain themselves. Another third have no retirement savings at all.

Is this a big shock, for all the experts? Is it really? Oh, come on. This article is a joke! Because as I say, in Britain 30 years ago they were saying these pension plans and all that are a big, big racket for those who do all the investing and lending out and then they get the returns and so much back, very little back. It was never intended to... Everything, again, has, you know, a *good* reason and then it has, for the insiders, the *real* reason. But there's just an article there just to show you the cons that go on. And then within Canada, where it's going to tell you that, you know, you'll be getting about \$6000 a year, after paying into this pension plan for 40 years or more. And they've got the age moved up on the old-age, retirement age and everything else, right, because they would rather you die before you claim it. Argh.

Anyway:

## **Canada to launch airstrikes against ISIS in Syria 'within days'**

[torontosun.com](http://torontosun.com) / April 02, 2015

Canada will begin launching airstrikes against ISIS (A: *That's just Al Qaeda that was funded by the West to overthrow all the countries in the Middle East.*) in Syria "within days," the commander of Joint Task Force Iraq says.

Brig.-Gen. Daniel Constable declined to give a specific date, but said the final details are being put into place before the Canadian military begins expanding its operation from Iraq into Syria.

"I think we're going to be good to go in reasonable short order." (A: *Well, that's very reassuring, that should be in a movie, that.*) Constable told a media briefing Thursday morning.

"The allies are excited about us getting into Syria as well because of our capabilities." (A: *I love these terms they use. It's like saying this country is going to invade. Did you give authorization? No, no. You [Alan chuckles.] get no authorization for anything, but you are put down as responsible for it too.*)

On Monday, the House of Commons passed the Conservatives' motion to

extend Canada's six-month mission against ISIS in Iraq for a year and expand operations to neighbouring Syria.

Now, we've got to go back a little bit here. If you remember 2001, and before 2001, the group that became the politicians during that era belonged also to the private group called the Project for a New American Century. George Bush and all the rest of them, Rumsfeld, Cheney, etc. etc., they all belong to this group, that listed in the 1990s the countries they wanted to take out across the Middle East. They were called neocons, because they were in league with Israel. And Israel came out with the same list. They wanted Iraq taken out. They wanted Libya taken out. They wanted Iran taken out, Syria taken out. They wanted all those countries taken out. Then General Wesley Clark came out and said the same thing on a live interview on television, it's probably up on YouTube somewhere. So they were trying to use their Al Qaeda bunch to do it, you see. But because enough people who watched this understood that Al Qaeda was being armed, through Qatar, now they call it Cutter for some reason but it was called Qatar, and that was the base that all the money and the arms to arm them all were coming into from the West. And because they were complaining about that, oh a breakaway group, which no, it's the same group and now they're called ISIS. Which by the way, the groups themselves don't call themselves ISIS, it's for your benefit to believe it is so.

And they initially started attacking Syria, because the human cry from the West at that time, in Israel and the States and Britain, everywhere, *we've got to get rid of Assad*. But they got bogged down, they couldn't take Syria and get rid of Assad. So then the US is going to get more involved with troops and all the rest of it, and then Putin of Russia stepped in as the spokesman for, again, the world community and says, hey, this is the old colonial empiricism going on here, expansion. And that didn't sound good, and the whole world went kind of, you know, one of these quiet guilty, you know, moods, and stepped back. So rather than us getting involved physically with troops they created the ISIS to attack instead, you see, and it got bogged down. But now that ISIS couldn't get rid of Assad they're back to the same rhetoric, *we've got to get rid of Assad*.

Because everybody on that list has to be taken out. It's very simple. They never change their tunes. Never, never. And so really, from Gulf War One the same agenda has been going on. Because this group, created privately a long time ago in London, England, that puts its members into parliaments and many have been prime ministers and so on, and in the States they are the same group that puts the members in to become presidents, for generations, have their world agenda there, and they own the media, and they are still on the go to do the same old things. So whenever they have a plan they never back out of the plan. You might think they'll delay it for a while or change it. No, no, they go back to it, always get back to it. You see.

So anyway, Canada is involved too, so there's going to be more blowback from this. And again too, they know darn well once they start bombing in Syria, and they're hoping for it by the way. I'm sure agencies do this, they'll hope for it, blowback, because then it can then *further* the agenda against them... Syria is the enemy. And there will be folk from Syria living in Canada perhaps, or elsewhere around the world, that will get really ticked off. That's the human response if your old homeland is attacked, you get ticked off. This is how they... This is *why* they



created multiculturalism. They flooded Britain with immigration from the 60s in some places then, and in the 70s it was stepped up, and in the 80s again, whoof. So you had all the folk inside of your country from the countries that you were going to attack down the road in the future. That way you can create martial law across all the countries, and the general population, even the traditional population, say, of Britain would also have to go under the scrutiny, you couldn't make exceptions and say, well you're, you know, British, blah, blah, blah, for many generations. So that's how you bring in martial law across everywhere. If you didn't have them all in the country, people who could stand up and say, hey that's our old homeland you're attacking, you couldn't pass totalitarian laws across the whole nation. You couldn't do it. It's a chessboard, you see.

So anyway, it's all part of the art of war, you see, and the techniques involved for long-term agendas, that the public are never ever given access to. An article tonight too is about you. *You*. Because they're always going to modify your behavior. You are the product of the culture industry. Your education, which is in bed by the way with the culture industry, everything must all work together to create the you that they want, with the behavior that they want, and the opinions that they want, for the era that you're in and so on. But there's an article here to do with behavioral Nudge Squad from the White House.

## **Here Comes the White House's Behavioral 'Nudge Squad'**

theblaze.com / Jul. 30, 2013 / Becket Adams

*(A: Now, this is what they have in Britain already, they've had it for years. It's behavioral scientists that work with the culture industry to give you almost subconscious nudges on what to do, what to think, how to behave, and what to believe. You are the ultimate creation of what they give you, what they feed you. It says here that:)*

The U.S. government is looking to recruit members for what some are calling a "Behavioral Insights Team," a panel of experts *(A: And you have been trained that experts must be always right, and real and, you know, expert at what they do. That's why they're called experts, right?)* that will study human behavior so as to "design public policies that work better *(A: Now, this is through public relations companies, this is what they'll tell you. Now remember, public relations is propaganda agencies, that's where 'public relations' came from. Bernays used 'propaganda', he thought it was the right term to use and he liked it. And 'public relations', again, came out later because it sounded more, again, user-friendly, more, more nice, rather than lying to you, for a goal that you wouldn't even understand. So...)* . . . "design public policies that work better, cost less, and help people to achieve their goals," *(A: To help people achieve their goals. It's good to be brainwashed, achieve your goals that, you know...)* according to a document describing the program. *(A: And I'll put the links up for that too. Actually it's on this article anyway, you can see it yourself.)*

"The federal government is currently creating a new team that will help build federal capacity to experiment with these approaches, and to scale behavioral interventions that have been rigorously evaluated, using, where possible, randomized controlled trials," the document reads. *(A: So they've already used all these trials in other work. Actually they've been using it for... your*

*whole life long.)*

"The team will be staffed by 4-5 experts in behavioral science and experimental design and evaluation," it adds.

FoxNews.com was the first to obtain and report on the White House's "Behavioral Insights Team" memo.

The document praises British Prime Minister David Cameron for implementing a similar "behavioral insights" (*A: It's actually called behavioral modification over there. That's what it is, you see.*) team in the U.K., claiming the group has advanced the priorities of the British government while also saving it at least £1 billion within the next five years. (*A: Well, that will pay, you know, .000000000% of this year's interest that they owe on loans.*)

The document also shows the White House is already coordinating similar programs with federal agencies including the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Agriculture.

*(A: And they go on and tell you all the different agencies that they're working this through.)*

"We are already working with over a dozen federal departments and agencies on newly-designed behavioral insights projects," the document reads, "including the Department of Labor, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Education (*A: Naturally, they've always done it through education.*), Veterans Administration, Department of Treasury, Social Security Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the United States Department of Agriculture."

Maya Shankar, a White House senior adviser on social and behavioral sciences, emailed the document to a university professor requesting he distribute it to people interested in applying for the gig. (*A: Oh, it's just a gig for them, right.*)

The document goes on to list the job responsibilities for the "central team":

*(A: Now, believe you me, when they give something out for public consumption you're only seeing...there's always two things given out. One is the one for public consumption, and there's always the one for the agencies themselves, that's totally different. So this is the user-friendly one.)*

- Build Capacity: Work with a broad range of federal agencies to identify new program areas that could benefit from the application of behavioral insights. (*A: What about using it on the politicians themselves, and test them for psychopathy. That would help us all.*) Help to design, implement, and test the relevant interventions using rigorous experimental methods. (*A: Oh, so they use rigorous experimental methods on you.*)

- Enhance Capacity: (*A: That sounds good, that's user-friendly.*) Provide conceptual and technical support to agencies with specific behavioral insights efforts already underway.

- Convene: Lead a multi-agency “community of practice” to identify and share promising practices and common challenges.

- Create and Provide Resources: Generate tutorials and other “how to” documents to help accelerate these efforts within agencies. (A: *Teachers get these things all the time, on how to brainwash the children, they call them toolkits.*) Manage online library of relevant documents and media.

- Help inspire new ideas: Work with external partners to identify research findings that can inform policy and practice.

However, some are leery of the fed’s new initiative; (A: *No kidding hey!*)

“Such policies — which encourage behavior subtly rather than outright require it — have come to be known as ‘nudges,’” FoxNews.com notes. (A: *Remember Sunstein?*)

The term comes from the 2008 book titled “Nudge” by Cass Sunstein and Chicago Booth School of Business professor Richard Thaler. Sunstein was the Obama administration’s regulations czar and is married to Samantha Power, Obama’s new pick for US ambassador to the UN. (A: *Naturally, you know.*)

(A: *Now, Cass Sunstein did not invent nudge. You've been getting this your whole life long, these nudges, through regular television shows, through school and different ways. They used to use peer group pressure because the majority of the public, the mass, will encourage the person who's going to be a bit different to go along with them, with all their opinions and everything else. That's old news actually. But they also do it through your Internet, oh people who liked this also liked that, you know. And then you help them with all the data, you know, folk who like this, tick this off, like this, dislike this. And you know, yeah, [Alan chuckles.] rats in the laboratory, and most folk are and they don't know it. )*

Cass Sunstein, former Director of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs at the Office of Management and Budget.

And associating the fed’s new “behavior insight” initiative with the term “nudge” isn’t too far off.

Indeed, as one professor who received the “Behavioral Insights Team” email wrote in an email to his colleagues: “Anyone interested in working for the White House in a ‘nudge’ squad? The UK has one and it’s been extraordinarily successful.”

“I am very skeptical of a team promoting nudge policies,” Utah State University professor Michael Thomas told FoxNews.com.

“Ultimately, nudging ... assumes a small group of people in government know better about choices than the individuals making them,” he added. (A: *Of course they do because they want you to be a little clone, through brainwashing, and use all kinds of techniques on you. And most folk, again,*

*will go along with the mass because they all want to be the same. And they understand all of this.)*

Of course, he continued, the government doesn't always get it right.

Dan Cruz, spokesman for the U.S. General Services Administration weighed in on the issue:

As part of the Administration's ongoing efforts to promote efficiency and savings (A: Ha. Ha.), GSA is considering adding some expertise from academia in the area of program efficiency and evaluation under its Performance Improvement Council.

Here's the "Behavioral Insights Team" pitch:

And I'll put the link up to it as well. And that's what it is, this is the exoteric pitch they give you, for you to understand how it's all going to be put on you. It's already getting used on you, all the time, and many... I could do 100 hours on it quite easily.

So you see, you understand, the greatest enemy of any mass system run by psychopaths is the person who can think for themselves, who hasn't been critically wounded mentally through growing up and life experiences. That's the greatest threat they have of all, so much so that Bertrand Russell who helped design the system that you're now living through today, and the whole degradation of the culture that you were to get brought through on the way, and the changing of all the gender stuff, all that was 50 years ago on their plan, actually longer than that, by people who are now dead. Long-term strategy planning and implementation, using all these techniques that they're claiming are new sciences. Which is a big joke.

So remember, you are a product of it to an extent. When you see people who will not listen, can't listen, who are completely at odds with everything you say, it's because the conditioning, they're nudging and all their conditioning work together to produce what you're looking at, that person. Perfect conditioning. But they themselves think they have made their own mind up on everything. That's how beautiful it all is. It's fascinating actually.

But anyway, that's just a little bit of the news. Don't panic over it. Don't cripple yourself by sweating over it. If you are in charge of your own mind you will see through all these things yourselves. And because of that you *do* have a firewall on your mind. Most folk don't. For them the mind has no firewall. It's up to you. And for those who can handle it, you can dig deeper. Don't go fanatically crazy digging into it forever and ever until you're like a manic-depressive. Simply take what you can handle at a time, at a time, and do a lot of thinking.

Believe it or not, thinking requires something called, which is really taboo, which is why they don't give it to you these days, they don't like it because it helps you along. It's called *silence*. Turn everything else off. All the data you want to think about is in your mind already, you go over it and peruse it in your mind. Your mind is awfully good at sorting and categorizing things out for you, cataloguing things. So use your mind. What a gift it is to have a mind. Why do you think there

are so many powers in the world all trying to destroy it and rob you of your mind? Think about that.

Anyway, from Hamish and myself, from a still wintery northern Ontario, Canada, it's good night and may your God or gods go with you.

Topics of show covered in following links:

[Diane Ablonczy Uses Air Quotes While Discussing 'Rule Of Law,' Bill C-51](#)

[Elizabeth May, Greens Say Bill C-51 Still Dangerous Despite Tory Amendments](#)

[After 50 Years of the Canada Pension Plan We've Run Off Course](#)

[Canada to launch airstrikes against ISIS in Syria 'within days'](#)

[Here Comes the White House's Behavioral 'Nudge Squad'](#)

---

### **Alan's Materials Available for Purchase and Ordering Information:**

- |                     |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>BOOKS</u></b> | "Cutting Through" & "Waiting for the Miracle....."<br>Volumes 1, 2, 3           | Also available in Spanish or Portuguese translation:<br>"Esperando el Milagro....." ( <a href="#"><u>Español</u></a> ) & "Esperando um Milagre....." ( <a href="#"><u>Português</u></a> ) |
| <b><u>CDs</u></b>   | Ancient Religions and History MP3 CDs:<br>Part 1 (1998) and Part 2 (1998-2000)  | & Blurbs and 'Cutting Through the Matrix' Shows on MP3 CDs (Up to 50 Hours per Disc)                                                                                                      |
| <b><u>DVDs</u></b>  | "Reality Check Part 1" & "Reality Check Part 2 - Wisdom, Esoterica and ...TIME" |                                                                                                                                                                                           |